

Appln. No. 10/016,990
Amendment dated December 11, 2003
Reply to Office Action mailed September 11, 2003

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 17, 18, 22, and 25 through 29 remain in this application. Claims 3 through 6, 9, 1 through 16, 19, 21, 23, and 24 have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn or added.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action

Claim 29 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 (first paragraph) as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention.

While it is submitted that, notwithstanding the showing of Figure 6, several of the other Figures in the application clearly disclose a clip with a "substantially uniform width" and a "substantially uniform thickness" that provides support for the requirements of claim 29, claim 29 has been amended to remove the language at issue and facilitate allowance of the other pending claims.

Withdrawal of the §112 (first paragraph) rejection of claim 29 is respectfully requested.

Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Office Action

Claims 25 through 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 (second paragraph) as being indefinite.

The above amendments to the claims are believed to clarify the requirements of the rejected claims, especially the particular points

Appln. No. 10/016,990
Amendment dated December 11, 2003
Reply to Office Action mailed September 11, 2003

identified in the Office Action. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to include an antecedent for "securing arm".

Withdrawal of the §112 rejection of claims 25 through 28 is therefore respectfully requested.

Paragraphs 5 through 7 of the Office Action

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waddell (5,215,236) in view of Walker et al. (4,928,864).

Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waddell (5,215,236) in view of DesSaulles (2,506,859).

Claim 1 has been amended to include the requirements of claim 21, which was indicated as being allowable in the Office Action if written into independent form. Therefore, claim 1, as well as claims 2, 7, 8, 10, 20, 22, 28, and 29, which depend from claim 1, are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejections of claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 20 is therefore respectfully requested.

Paragraph 7 of the Office Action

Claims 17 and 18 have been allowed.

Paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Office Action

Paragraph 8 of the Office Action states that claims 21 and 22 would be allowable if written into independent form with the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Paragraph 9 of the Office Action indicates that claims 25 through 28 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s)

Appln. No. 10/016,990
Amendment dated December 11, 2003
Reply to Office Action mailed September 11, 2003

under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in the Office Action.


The above amendment incorporates the limitations of claim 1 into the recitation of claim 27, and therefore claim 27 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 28, by virtue of its dependency from amended claim 27, is also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KAARDAL & LEONARD, L.L.P.

By 
Ivar M. Kaardal (Reg. No. 29,812)
KAARDAL & LEONARD, L.L.P.
3500 South First Avenue Circle, Suite 250
Sioux Falls, SD 57105-5802
(605)336-9446 FAX (605)336-1931
e-mail patent@kaardal.com

Date: 12/11/03